

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

:

Case Number: 3:17-cr-171

Plaintiff,

- vs -

PATRICK BIRT,

District Judge Walter Herbert Rice

Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

Defendant. :

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This case came on for hearing on April 13, 2018. The United States was represented by Assistant United States Attorney Dominick Gerace and Defendant was represented by Attorney Michael Monta. Pursuant to General Order DAY 13-01, Judge Rice requested the Magistrate Judge to preside and Defendant orally consented.

The undersigned examined Defendant under oath as to his understanding of the Plea Agreement and the effect of entering a plea pursuant to that Agreement. Having conducted the colloquy, the Magistrate Judge is persuaded the Defendant understands the rights waived by entering a guilty plea and is competent to do so. The Magistrate Judge also concludes that execution of the Plea Agreement, which was acknowledged in open court, is Defendant's voluntary, knowing, and intelligent act. It is therefore respectfully recommended that the Plea Agreement be accepted.

Defendant having executed the Plea Agreement, tendered a plea of guilty to the offense

charged in Count 2 of the Indictment. The Magistrate Judge concludes the guilty plea is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary and that the Statement of Facts made a part of the Plea Agreement, whose truth Defendant acknowledged, provides a sufficient factual basis for a finding of guilt. It is therefore respectfully recommended that the guilty plea be accepted and Defendant be found guilty as charged in Count 2 of the Indictment.

Anticipating the District Court's adoption of this Report and Recommendations, the Magistrate Judge referred the Defendant for a pre-sentence investigation, ordered return of the Defendant to state custody as promptly as possible consistent with preparation of the Presentence Investigation Report, and set sentencing before District Judge Walter H. Rice on July 11, 2018, at 1:30 A.M. in Courtroom No. 1.

April 13, 2018.

s/ *Michael R. Merz*
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(2), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendations are based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).